

Dynamics of the Langevin model subjected to colored noise: Functional-integral method

Hideo Hasegawa ¹

*Department of Physics, Tokyo Gakugei University
Koganei, Tokyo 184-8501, Japan*

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We have discussed the dynamics of Langevin model subjected to colored noise, by using the functional-integral method (FIM) combined with equations of motion for mean and variance of the state variable. Two sets of colored noise have been investigated: (a) one additive and one multiplicative colored noise, and (b) one additive and two multiplicative colored noise. The case (b) is examined with the relevance to a recent controversy on the stationary subthreshold voltage distribution of an integrate-and-fire model including stochastic excitatory and inhibitory synapses and a noisy input. We have studied the stationary probability distribution and dynamical responses to time-dependent (pulse and sinusoidal) inputs of the linear Langevin model. Model calculations have shown that results of the FIM are in good agreement with those of direct simulations (DSs). A comparison is made among various approximate analytic solutions such as the universal colored noise approximation (UCNA). It has been pointed out that dynamical responses to pulse and sinusoidal inputs calculated by the UCNA are rather different from those of DS and the FIM, although they yield the same stationary distribution.

PACS No. 05.10.Gg, 05.45.-a, 84.35.+i

Keywords: Langevin model, colored noise, functional-integral method

Address: 4-1-1, Nukui-kita machi, Koganei, Tokyo 184-8501, Japan

¹e-mail address: hideohasegawa@goo.jp

1 Introduction

Nonlinear stochastic dynamics of physical, chemical, biological and economical systems has been extensively studied (for a recent review, see Ref. [1]). In most theoretical studies, Gaussian white noise is employed as random driving force because of its mathematical simplicity. The white-noise approximation is appropriate to systems in which the time scale characterizing the relaxation of the noise is much shorter than the characteristic time scale of the system. There has been a growing interest in theoretical study of nonlinear dynamical systems subjected to colored noise with the finite correlation time (for a review on colored noise, see Ref. [2]: related references therein). It has been realized that colored noise gives rise to new intriguing effects such as the reentrant phenomenon in a noise-induced transition [3] and a resonant activation in bistable systems [4].

The original model for a system driven by colored noise is expressed by non-Markovian stochastic differential equation. This problem may be transformed to a Markovian one, by extending the number of relevant variables and including an additional differential equation describing the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process. It is difficult to analytically solve the Langevin model subjected to *colored* noise. For its analytical study, two approaches have been adopted: (1) to construct the multi-dimensional Fokker-Planck equation (FPE) for the multivariate probability distribution, and (2) to derive the effective one-dimensional FPE equation. The presence of multi-variables in the approach (1) makes a calculation of even the stationary distribution much difficult. In a recent study on the Langevin model subjected to additive (non-Gaussian) colored noise [5], we employed the approach (1), analyzing the multivariate FPE with the use of the second-order moment method. A typical example of the approach (2) is the universal colored noise approximation (UCNA) [6], which interpolates between the limits of zero and infinite relaxation times, and which has been widely adopted for a study of colored noise [2]. Another example of the approach (2) is the path-integral and functional-integral methods [7]-[12] obtaining the effective FPE, with which stationary properties such as the non-Gaussian stationary distribution have been studied [2].

Theoretical study on the Langevin model driven by colored noise has been mostly made for its stationary properties such as the stationary probability distribution and the phase diagram of noise-induced transition [2]. As far as we are aware of, little theoretical study has been reported on dynamical properties such as the response to time-dependent inputs. Refs. [13, 14] have discussed the filtering effect, in which the high-frequency response of

the system is shown to be improved by colored noise. The purpose of the present paper is to extend the functional-integral method (FIM) such that we may discuss dynamical properties of the Langevin model subjected to colored noise. We consider, in this paper, two sets of colored noise: (a) one additive and one multiplicative colored noise, and (b) one additive and two multiplicative colored noise. The case (b) is included to clarify, to some extent, a recent controversy on the subthreshold voltage distribution of a leaky integrate-and-fire model including conductance-based stochastic excitatory and inhibitory synapses as well as noisy inputs [15]-[18].

The paper is organized as follows. The FIM is applied to the above-mentioned cases (a) and (b) in Secs. 2 and 3, respectively, where the stationary distribution and the response to time-dependent inputs are studied. In Sec. 4, we will discuss the recent controversy on the subthreshold voltage distribution of a leaky integrate-and-fire model [15]-[18]. A comparison is made among results of some approximate analytical theories such as the UCNA [2, 6]. The final Sec. 5 is devoted to conclusion.

2 Langevin model subjected to one additive and one multiplicative colored noise

2.1 Effective Langevin equation

We have considered the Langevin model subjected to additive and multiplicative colored noise given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + \eta_0(t) + G(x)\eta_1(t), \quad (1)$$

with

$$\frac{d\eta_m(t)}{dt} = -\frac{\eta_m}{\tau_m} + \frac{\sqrt{2D_m}}{\tau_m} \xi_m(t), \quad (m = 0 \text{ and } 1) \quad (2)$$

where $F(x)$ and $G(x)$ denote arbitrary functions of x : $\eta_0(t)$ and $\eta_1(t)$ stand for additive and multiplicative noise, respectively: τ_m and D_m express the relaxation times and the strengths of colored noise for additive ($m = 0$) and multiplicative noise ($m = 1$): $\eta_m(t)$ express independent zero-mean Gaussian white noise with correlations given by

$$\langle \xi_m(t) \xi_n(t') \rangle = \delta_{mn} \delta(t - t'). \quad (3)$$

The distribution and correlation of η_m are given by

$$p(\eta_m) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_m}{2D_m} \eta_m^2\right), \quad (4)$$

$$c_{mn}(t, t') = \langle \eta_m(t) \eta_n(t') \rangle = \delta_{mn} \left(\frac{D_m}{\tau_m} \right) \exp \left(-\frac{|t - t'|}{\tau_m} \right). \quad (5)$$

By applying the FIM to the Langevin model given by Eqs. (1) and (2), we obtain the effective FPE given by [7, 11] (details being given in the Appendix)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(x, t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \tilde{F}(x) p(x, t) + \tilde{D}_0 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} p(x, t) + \tilde{D}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G(x) p(x, t), \quad (6)$$

from which the effective Langevin model is derived as

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \tilde{F}(x) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_0} \xi_0(t) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_1} G(x) \xi_1(t), \quad (7)$$

with

$$\tilde{F} = F, \quad (8)$$

$$\tilde{D}_0 = \frac{D_0}{(1 - \tau_0 \langle F' \rangle)}, \quad (9)$$

$$\tilde{D}_1 = \frac{D_1}{[1 - \tau_1 (\langle F' \rangle - \langle FG'/G \rangle)]}. \quad (10)$$

Here $F' = dF/dx$ and $G' = dG/dx$, and the bracket $\langle \cdot \rangle$ expresses the average over $p(x, t)$ to be discussed shortly [Eq. (11)]. It is noted that we will temporally evaluate $\langle F' \rangle$ *etc.* in order to discuss dynamics of the system, while they are conventionally evaluated for the stationary value as $F'(x_s)$ *etc.* with $x_s = \langle x(t = \infty) \rangle$ [7, 11].

2.2 Equations of motion for mean and variance

With the use of the effective FPE given by Eq. (7), an equation of motion for the average of $Q(x)$:

$$\langle Q \rangle = \int Q(x) p(x, t) dx, \quad (11)$$

is given by [19]

$$\frac{d\langle Q \rangle}{dt} = \langle Q' \tilde{F} \rangle + \tilde{D}_0 \langle Q'' \rangle + \tilde{D}_1 \langle (Q' G)' G \rangle, \quad (12)$$

which yields (for $Q = x, x^2$)

$$\frac{d\langle x \rangle}{dt} = \langle \tilde{F} \rangle + \tilde{D}_1 \langle G' G \rangle, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{d\langle x^2 \rangle}{dt} = 2\langle x \tilde{F} \rangle + 2\tilde{D}_0 + 2\tilde{D}_1 \langle G^2 + x G' G \rangle. \quad (14)$$

Mean (μ) and variance (γ) are defined by

$$\mu = \langle x \rangle, \quad (15)$$

$$\gamma = \langle x^2 \rangle - \langle x \rangle^2. \quad (16)$$

Expanding Eqs. (13) and (14) around the mean value of μ , and retaining up to the second order of $\langle (\delta x_i)^2 \rangle$, we get equations of motion for μ and γ expressed by [19]

$$\frac{d\mu}{dt} = \tilde{f}_0 + \tilde{f}_2\gamma + \tilde{D}_1[g_0g_1 + 3(g_1g_2 + g_0g_3)\gamma], \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dt} = 2\tilde{f}_1\gamma + 4\tilde{D}_1\gamma(g_1^2 + 2g_0g_2) + 2\tilde{D}_1g_0^2 + 2\tilde{D}_0, \quad (18)$$

where $\tilde{f}_\ell = (1/\ell!)\partial^\ell \tilde{F}(\mu)/\partial x^\ell$ and $g_\ell = (1/\ell!)\partial^\ell G(\mu)/\partial x^\ell$. It is noted that $\tilde{D}_0$ and $\tilde{D}_1$ in Eqs. (17) and (18) are given by Eqs. (9) and (10), respectively.

In the case of $F(x) = -\lambda x + I$ and $G(x) = x$ where λ and I denote the relaxation rate and an input, respectively, the FIM yields equations of motion for μ and γ given by

$$\frac{d\mu}{dt} = -\lambda\mu + \tilde{D}_1\mu + I, \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dt} = -2\lambda\gamma + 4\tilde{D}_1\gamma + 2\tilde{D}_1\mu^2 + 2\tilde{D}_0, \quad (20)$$

with

$$\tilde{D}_0 = \frac{D_0}{(1 + \lambda\tau_0)}, \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{D}_1 = \frac{D_1}{[1 + (\tau_1 I/\mu)]}. \quad (22)$$

We have to solve Eqs. (19)-(22) for μ , γ , $\tilde{D}_0$ and $\tilde{D}_1$ in a self-consistent way.

Stationary values of μ and γ are implicitly given by

$$\mu_s = \frac{I}{(\lambda - \tilde{D}_1)}, \quad (23)$$

$$\gamma_s = \frac{(\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1\mu_s^2)}{(\lambda - 2\tilde{D}_1)}, \quad (24)$$

with $\tilde{D}_0$ and $\tilde{D}_1$ given by Eqs. (21) and (22), respectively, with $\mu = \mu_s$. Equations (23) and (24) show that μ_s and γ_s diverge for $\tilde{D}_1 > \lambda$ and $\tilde{D}_1 > \lambda/2$, respectively. The divergence of moments is common in systems subjected to multiplicative noise, because its stationary distribution has a long-tail power-law structure [19]-[21]. From Eqs. (22)

and (23), we get

$$\tilde{D}_1 = \frac{D_1}{[1 + \tau_1(\lambda - \tilde{D}_1)]}, \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\tau_1} \left[(1 + \lambda\tau_1) - \sqrt{(1 + \lambda\tau_1)^2 - 4\tau_1 D_1} \right], \quad (26)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_1 &= \left(\frac{D_1}{1 + \lambda\tau_1} \right) \left[1 + \frac{\tau_1 D_1}{(1 + \lambda\tau_1)^2} - 2 \frac{\tau_1^2 D_1^2}{(1 + \lambda\tau_1)^4} + \dots \right], \\ &\simeq \frac{D_1}{(1 + \lambda\tau_1)} \equiv \tilde{D}_1^{APP}. \quad \text{for } \tau_1 D_1 / (1 + \lambda\tau_1)^2 \ll 1 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Equation (27) implies that the approximation of $\tilde{D}_1^{APP}$ is valid both for (i) $\tau_1 \ll (1/\lambda, 1/D_1)$ and (ii) $\tau_1 \gg (1/\lambda, D_1/\lambda^2)$.

2.3 Stationary distribution

From the effective FPE given by Eq. (7), we get the stationary distribution $p(x)$ given by

$$\ln p(x) = - \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \ln [\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1 G(x)^2] + Z(x), \quad (28)$$

with

$$Z(x) = \int \frac{F(x)}{[\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1 G(x)^2]} dx. \quad (29)$$

Because of the presence of multiplicative noise, the stationary distribution generally has non-Gaussian power-law structure [19]-[21].

In the white-noise limit ($\tau_m = 0$), the stationary distribution for the Langevin equation given by Eq. (1) with $\eta_m = \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_m}$ is expressed by Eqs. (28) and (29) with $\tilde{D}_m = D_m$ in the Stratonovich representation. Then the stationary distribution for colored noise is expressed by

$$p(x; D_0, D_1, \tau_0, \tau_1) = p(x; \tilde{D}_0, \tilde{D}_1, 0, 0) \equiv p_{wn}(x; \tilde{D}_0, \tilde{D}_1), \quad (30)$$

where $p_{wn}(x; \tilde{D}_0, \tilde{D}_1)$ expresses the stationary distribution for white noise.

In the case of $F(x) = -\lambda x + I$ and $G(x) = x$, we get

$$p(x) \propto (\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1 x^2)^{-(\lambda/2\tilde{D}_1 + 1/2)} \exp[Y(x)], \quad (31)$$

with

$$Y(x) = \frac{I}{\sqrt{\tilde{D}_0 \tilde{D}_1}} \cdot \tan^{-1} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\tilde{D}_1}{\tilde{D}_0}} x \right), \quad (32)$$

$$\tilde{D}_0 = \frac{D_0}{(1 + \lambda\tau_0)}, \quad (33)$$

$$\tilde{D}_1 = \frac{D_1}{[1 + (\tau_1 I / \mu_s)]}, \quad (34)$$

where μ_s expresses the stationary value of μ [Eq. (23)].

2.4 Model calculations

2.4.1 Stationary properties

In order to demonstrate the feasibility of our analytical theory, we have performed model calculations. Direct simulations (DSs) for Eqs. (1) and (2) have been performed by using the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method for period of 1000 with a time mesh of 0.01. Results of DSs are the average over hundred thousands trials otherwise noticed. All quantities are dimensionless.

The τ_1 dependence of the ratio of $\tilde{D}_1/D_1$ is depicted in Fig.1, where results calculated by the FIM and the approximation (APP) given by Eq. (27) are shown by solid and dashed curves, respectively, for $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$. $\tilde{D}_1$ calculated by the APP is in good agreement with that by the FIM, and the effective noise strength is decreased with increasing τ_1 . The difference between $\tilde{D}_1/D_1$ of the FIM and APP, plotted by the chain curve, is zero at $\tau_1 = 0$ with a maximum at $\tau_1 \sim 0.5$, and decreased at larger $\tau_1 (> 1)$. The APP is fairly good for small τ_1 and large τ_1 , as discussed after Eq. (27).

Figure 2 (a)-(f) show the stationary distribution $p(x)$ calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), with the APP (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (WN: double-chain curves) when τ_1 is changed for fixed values of $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$: (a), (c) and (e) in normal scale, and (b), (d) and (f) in log scale. Calculations show that with increasing τ_1 , $p(x)$ becomes narrower, deviating from results of WN. Results of the FIM and APP are in fairly good agreement with those of DS: results of the APP is indistinguishable from those of the FIM. Figures 2(b), (d) and (f) plotting $p(x)$ in log scale show that results of the FIM and APP are in fairly good agreement with that of DS up to the order of 10^{-2} for $\tau_1 = 1.0$ and of 10^{-4} for $\tau_1 = 5.0$.

2.4.2 Dynamical properties

We have investigated the response to an applied pulse input given by

$$I(t) = A\Theta(t - t_b) \Theta(t_e - t) + B, \quad (35)$$

where $A = 0.5$, $B = 0.1$, $t_b = 100$ and $t_e = 200$, and $\Theta(t)$ is the Heaviside function. Time courses of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ are shown in Fig. 3(a)-(f), where τ_1 is changed for fixed values of $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$. With increasing τ_1 , $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ induced by an applied pulse at $t_b < t < t_e$ are decreased. This is because they are given by

$$\mu(t) = \frac{(A+B)}{(\lambda - \tilde{D}_1)}, \quad (36)$$

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{\tilde{D}_0}{(\lambda - 2\tilde{D}_1)} + \frac{(A+B)^2 \tilde{D}_1}{(\lambda - 2\tilde{D}_1)(\lambda - \tilde{D}_1)^2}, \quad \text{for } t_b < t < t_e \quad (37)$$

where $\tilde{D}_1$ is decreased with increasing τ_1 as Fig. 1 shows. The results of the FIM and APP are again in good agreement with that of the DS: the FIM yields slightly better results than the APP as shown in Figs. 3(b) and 3(f).

Next we study the response to a sinusoidal input given by

$$I(t) = C \sin \omega t, \quad (38)$$

where $C = 0.5$, $\omega = 2\pi/T_p$ and $T_p = 100$. Figures 4(a), (c) and (f) show time courses of $\mu(t)$, and Figs. 4(b), (d) and (f) those of $\gamma(t)$ when τ_1 is changed for fixed values of $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$. With increasing τ_1 , the magnitude of $\mu(t)$ is decreased. This is understood from an analysis with the use of Eq. (19), which yields

$$\mu(t) = \frac{C}{\sqrt{(\lambda - \tilde{D}_1)^2 + \omega^2}} \sin(\omega t - \phi), \quad (39)$$

with

$$\phi = \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{\omega}{\lambda - \tilde{D}_1} \right). \quad (40)$$

Equation (39) shows that with increasing ω (*i.e.* decreasing T_p), the magnitude of $\mu(t)$ is decreased, representing a character of the low-pass filter.

3 Langevin model subjected to one additive and two multiplicative colored noise

3.1 Effective Langevin equation

We have assumed the Langevin model subjected to one additive (η_0) and two multiplicative colored noise (η_1 , η_2), as given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + \eta_0(t) + G_1(x)\eta_1(t) + G_2(x)\eta_2(t), \quad (41)$$

with

$$\frac{d\eta_m(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_m}\eta_m + \frac{\sqrt{2D_m}}{\tau_m}\xi_m(t), \quad (m = 0, 1, 2) \quad (42)$$

where $F(x)$, $G_1(x)$ and $G_2(x)$ express arbitrary functions of x , and ξ_m are independent zero-mean white noise with correlation:

$$\langle \xi_m(t) \xi_n(t') \rangle = \delta_{mn} \delta(t - t'). \quad (43)$$

Applying the FIM [11] to the model under consideration, we get the effective FPE given by (details being given in the Appendix):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(x, t) &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \tilde{F}(x) p(x, t) + \tilde{D}_0 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} p(x, t) \\ &+ \tilde{D}_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_1(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_1(x) p(x, t) + \tilde{D}_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_2(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_2(x) p(x, t), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

from which we get the effective Langevin equation:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_0} \xi_0(t) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_1} G_1(x) \xi_1(t) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_2} G_2(x) \xi_2(t), \quad (45)$$

with

$$\tilde{D}_0 = \frac{D_0}{(1 - \tau_0 \langle F' \rangle)}, \quad (46)$$

$$\tilde{D}_m = \frac{D_m}{[1 - \tau_m (\langle F' \rangle - \langle F G'_m / G_m \rangle)]}, \quad (m = 1, 2) \quad (47)$$

where $F' = dF/dx$ and $G'_m = dG_m/dx$, and the bracket $\langle \cdot \rangle$ stands for the average over $p(x, t)$:

$$\langle Q(x) \rangle = \int Q(x) p(x, t) dx. \quad (48)$$

3.2 Equations of motion for mean and variance

By using the effective FPE given by Eq. (45), we can obtain equations of motion for mean (μ) and variance (γ) defined by

$$\mu = \langle x \rangle, \quad (49)$$

$$\gamma = \langle x^2 \rangle - \langle x \rangle^2. \quad (50)$$

When $F(x)$ and $G_m(x)$ are given by

$$F(x) = -\lambda x + I, \quad (51)$$

$$G_m = a_m(x - e_m), \quad (m = 1, 2) \quad (52)$$

where λ is the relaxation rate, I an input, and a_m and e_m constants, we get equations of motion for μ and γ given by [19]

$$\frac{d\mu}{dt} = -\lambda\mu + I + \tilde{D}_1(\mu - e_1) + \tilde{D}_2(\mu - e_2), \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dt} = -2\lambda\gamma + 4(\tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2)\gamma + 2\tilde{D}_2(\mu - e_1)^2 + 2\tilde{D}_2(\mu - e_2)^2 + 2\tilde{D}_0, \quad (54)$$

with

$$\tilde{D}_0 = \frac{D_0}{(1 + \lambda\tau_0)}, \quad (55)$$

$$\tilde{D}_m = \frac{D_m}{[1 + \tau_m(-\lambda e_m + I)/(\mu - e_m)]}. \quad (\text{for } m = 1, 2) \quad (56)$$

It is necessary to self-consistently solve Eqs. (53)-(56) for μ , γ , $\tilde{D}_0$, $\tilde{D}_1$ and $\tilde{D}_2$.

Stationary values of μ and γ are implicitly given by

$$\mu_s = \frac{(I - \tilde{D}_1 e_1 - \tilde{D}_2 e_2)}{(\lambda - \tilde{D}_1 - \tilde{D}_2)}, \quad (57)$$

$$\gamma_s = \frac{[\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1(\mu_s - e_1)^2 + \tilde{D}_2(\mu_s - e_2)^2]}{[\lambda - 2(\tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2)]}, \quad (58)$$

with $\tilde{D}_m$ ($m = 0, 1, 2$) given by Eqs. (55) and (56) with $\mu = \mu_s$. Equations (57) and (58) show that μ_s and γ_s diverge for $(\tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2) > \lambda$ and $(\tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2) > \lambda/2$, respectively. Equation (27) suggests that the approximation given by

$$\tilde{D}_m \simeq \frac{D_m}{(1 + \lambda\tau_m)} \equiv \tilde{D}_m^{APP}, \quad \text{for } \tau_m D_m / (1 + \lambda\tau_m)^2 \ll 1 \quad (m = 1, 2) \quad (59)$$

may be valid both for small τ_m and large τ_m , as will be numerically shown in Fig. 5 [22].

3.3 Stationary distribution

From the effective FPE of Eq. (45), we get the stationary distribution $p(x)$ given by [19]

$$\ln p(x) = -\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \ln[\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1 G_1^2(x) + \tilde{D}_2 G_2^2(x)] + Z(x), \quad (60)$$

with

$$Z(x) = \int \frac{F(x)}{[\tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1 G_1^2(x) + \tilde{D}_2 G_2^2(x)]} dx. \quad (61)$$

In the white-noise limit ($\tau_m = 0$), the stationary distribution of the Langevin model given by Eq. (41) with $\eta_m = \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_m}$ ($m = 0, 1, 2$), is expressed by [19]-[21]

$$\ln p(x) = Z(x) - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \ln[D_0 + D_1 G_1^2(x) + D_2 G_2^2(x)], \quad (62)$$

with

$$Z(x) = \int \frac{F(x)}{[D_0 + D_1 G_1^2(x) + D_2 G_2^2(x)]} dx, \quad (63)$$

in the Stratonovich representation. It agrees with the distribution given by Eqs. (60) and (61) with $\tilde{D}_m = D_m$.

When $F(x)$ and $G_m(x)$ are given by Eqs. (51) and (52), we get

$$p(v) \propto (d_2 v^2 + d_1 v + d_0)^{-(\lambda/2d_2 + 1/2)} \exp[Y(v)], \quad (64)$$

with

$$Y(v) = \left(\frac{2Id_2 + \lambda d_1}{d_2 \sqrt{4d_0 d_2 - d_1^2}} \right) \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{2d_2 v + d_1}{\sqrt{4d_0 d_2 - d_1^2}} \right), \quad (65)$$

where

$$\tilde{D}_0 = \frac{D_0}{(1 + \lambda \tau_0)}, \quad (66)$$

$$\tilde{D}_m = \frac{D_m}{[1 + \tau_m(-\lambda e_m + I)/(\mu_s - e_m)]}, \quad (\text{for } m = 1, 2) \quad (67)$$

$$d_0 = \tilde{D}_0 + \tilde{D}_1 a_1^2 e_1^2 + \tilde{D}_2 a_2^2 e_2^2 \quad (68)$$

$$d_1 = -2(\tilde{D}_1 a_1^2 e_1 + \tilde{D}_2 a_2^2 e_2) \quad (69)$$

$$d_2 = \tilde{D}_1 a_1^2 + \tilde{D}_2 a_2^2, \quad (70)$$

μ_s denoting the stationary value [Eqs. (57) and (58)].

It is easy to see that for additive noise only ($D_1 = D_2 = 0$), the distribution becomes the Gaussian given by

$$p(x) \propto \exp \left[-\frac{\lambda}{2d_0} \left(x - \frac{I}{\lambda} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (71)$$

When multiplicative noise is included, $p(x)$ becomes the non-Gaussian distribution with power-law tails.

3.4 Model calculations

3.4.1 Stationary properties

Figure 5 shows $\tilde{D}_m/D_m$ ($m = 1, 2$) as a function of τ_1 calculated by the FIM for $m = 1$ (solid curve) and $m = 2$ (dashed curve) with fixed values of $\tau_2/\tau_1 = 10$, $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$,

$D_1 = 0.1$, $D_2 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$. With increasing τ_1 ($= \tau_2/10$), $\tilde{D}_1/D_1$ and $\tilde{D}_2/D_2$ are gradually decreased. In order to examine the validity of the approximation (APP) given by $\tilde{D}_m^{APP}$ in Eq. (59), we show differences between $\tilde{D}_m/D_m$ of the FIM and APP for $m = 1$ (chain curve) and $m = 2$ (double-chain curve). Both the differences start from zero at $\tau_1 = 0$, have maxima at $\tau_1 \sim 0.5 - 1$, and are decreased at larger τ_1 . This shows that the APP is valid both for small τ_1 and large τ_1 , whose behavior is similar to that shown in Fig. 1.

Figures 6(a)-(f) show the stationary distribution $p(x)$ calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the APP (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (double chain curves), when τ_1 and τ_2 are changed with a fixed ratio of $\tau_2/\tau_1 = 10$, and $\tau_0 = 0.01$, $I = 0.5$, $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.1$ and $D_2 = 0.2$: Fig. 6(a), (c) and (e) are plotted in normal scale while Fig. 6(b), (d) and (f) in log scale. With increasing the relaxation time for multiplicative colored noise, the width of $p(x)$ is decreased and its profile approaches the Gaussian.

3.4.2 Dynamical properties

Responses of $\mu(t)$ to a pulse input given by Eq. (35) are shown in Figs. 7(a), (c) and (e) by changing the relaxation time with a fixed value of $\tau_2/\tau_1 = 10$. They are calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the APP (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (WN: double-chain curves). Similarly the response of $\gamma(t)$ are plotted in Fig. 7(b), (d) and (f). With increasing the relaxation time of colored noise, the effective noise strength is decreased, and then the values of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ at $100 < t < 200$ is decreased, as shown by Eqs. (39) and (40). Figures 7(d) and 7(f) show that the FIM yield slightly better results than the APP. The general trend of the effect of the relaxation time on $p(x)$, $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ shown in Figs. 6 and 7 is the same as that shown in Figs. 2 and 3.

4 Discussion

4.1 A controversy on the subthreshold voltage distribution

In recent years, a controversy has been made on the subthreshold voltage distribution of a leaky integrate-and-fire model [15]-[18]. The adopted model includes conductance-based stochastic excitatory and inhibitory synapses as well as noisy inputs, as given by [15]-[18]

$$C \frac{dv}{dt} = -g_L(v - E_L) - \frac{1}{a} I_{syn}(t), \quad (72)$$

with

$$I_{syn}(t) = g_e(v - E_e) + g_i(v - E_i) - I_I(t). \quad (73)$$

Here C denotes the membrane capacitance, a the membrane area, g_L and E_L the leak conductance and reversal potential, and $g_{e,i}$ and $E_{e,i}$ are the noisy conductances and reversal potentials of excitatory (e) and inhibitory (i) synapses, respectively. Stochastic $g_{e,i}$ and noisy additional input $I_I(t)$ are assumed to be described by the OU process given by

$$\frac{dg_e}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_e}(g_e - g_{e0}) + \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_e^2}{\tau_e}}\xi_e(t), \quad (74)$$

$$\frac{dg_i}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_i}(g_i - g_{i0}) + \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_i^2}{\tau_i}}\xi_i(t), \quad (75)$$

$$\frac{dI_I}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_I}(I_I - I_0) + \sqrt{\frac{2\sigma_I^2}{\tau_I}}\xi_I(t), \quad (76)$$

where ξ_e *et el.* are independent zero-mean white noise with correlation:

$$\langle \xi_\kappa(t) \xi_{\kappa'}(t') \rangle = \delta_{\kappa\kappa'} \delta(t - t'). \quad (\kappa = I, e, i) \quad (77)$$

In the first paper of Rudolph and Destexhe (RD1) [15], they derived an expression for the stationary distribution function of the system described by Eqs. (72)-(76). In their second paper (RD2) [16], they modified their expression to cover a larger parameter regime. Lindner and Longtin [17] criticized that the result of RD1 does not reconcile the result of white-noise limit and that the extended expression of RD2 does not solve the colored-noise problem though it is much better than that of RD1. In the third paper of Rudolph and Destexhe (RD3) [18], they claimed that the result of RD2 is the best from a comparison among various approximate analytic expressions for the stationary distribution. It has been controversy which of approximate analytic expressions having been proposed so far may best explain the result of DSs.

It is worthwhile to apply our method mentioned in Sec. 3 to the system given by Eq. (72)-(76), which are rewritten as

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = F(v) + G_I \eta_I(t) + G_e(v) \eta_e(t) + G_i(v) \eta_i(t), \quad (78)$$

with

$$\frac{\partial \eta_\kappa(t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{\tau_\kappa} \eta_\kappa + \frac{\sqrt{2D_\kappa}}{\tau_\kappa} \xi_\kappa(t), \quad (\kappa = e, i, I) \quad (79)$$

where

$$F(v) = -\frac{1}{C}g_L(v - E_m) - \frac{1}{Ca}[g_{e0}(v - E_e) + g_{i0}(v - E_i) - I_0], \quad (80)$$

$$G_I = \frac{1}{Ca}, \quad (81)$$

$$G_{e,i}(v) = -\frac{1}{Ca}(v - E_{e,i}), \quad (82)$$

$$D_{I,e,i} = \tau_{I,e,i}\sigma_{I,e,i}^2. \quad (83)$$

By using Eqs. (64)-(70), we get the stationary distribution $p(v)$ given by

$$p(v) \propto (d_2v^2 + d_1v + d_0)^{-(\lambda/2d_2+1/2)} \exp[Y(v)], \quad (84)$$

with

$$Y(v) = \left(\frac{2c_0d_2 + \lambda d_1}{d_2\sqrt{4d_0d_2 - d_1^2}} \right) \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{2d_2v + d_1}{\sqrt{4d_0d_2 - d_1^2}} \right), \quad (85)$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{C}g_L + \frac{1}{Ca}(g_{e0} + g_{i0}), \quad (86)$$

$$c_0 = \frac{1}{C}g_LE_m + \frac{1}{Ca}(g_{e0}E_e + g_{i0}E_i + I_{I0}), \quad (87)$$

$$d_0 = \frac{1}{C^2a^2}(\tilde{D}_I + \tilde{D}_eE_e^2 + \tilde{D}_iE_i^2), \quad (88)$$

$$d_1 = -\frac{2}{C^2a^2}(\tilde{D}_eE_e + \tilde{D}_iE_i), \quad (89)$$

$$d_2 = \frac{1}{C^2a^2}(\tilde{D}_e + \tilde{D}_i). \quad (90)$$

With the use of Eqs. (57) and (58), $\tilde{D}_\kappa$ in Eqs. (88)-(90) are expressed by

$$\tilde{D}_I = \frac{D_I}{(1 + \lambda\tau_I)}, \quad (91)$$

$$\tilde{D}_e = \frac{D_e}{[1 + \tau_e(-\lambda E_e + c_0)/(\mu_s - E_e)]}, \quad (92)$$

$$\tilde{D}_i = \frac{D_i}{[1 + \tau_i(-\lambda E_i + c_0)/(\mu_s - E_i)]}. \quad (93)$$

Here μ_s denotes the stationary value of v which is determined by the self-consistent equations for μ_s , γ_s , $\tilde{D}_e$ and $\tilde{D}_i$ [as Eqs. (57) and (58)], though their explicit expressions are not necessary for our discussion.

In the limit of small relaxation times, Eqs. (92) and (93) yield

$$\tilde{D}_e \simeq \frac{D_e}{(1 + \lambda\tau_e)}, \quad (\text{for } \tau_e D_e \ll 1) \quad (94)$$

$$\tilde{D}_i \simeq \frac{D_i}{(1 + \lambda\tau_i)}. \quad (\text{for } \tau_i D_i \ll 1) \quad (95)$$

This is nothing but the approximation introduced in RD2 [16].

In the white-noise limit ($\tau_{I,e,i} = 0$), the stationary distribution of the model given by Eq. (78) with $\eta_\kappa = \sqrt{2D_\kappa}$ ($\kappa = I, e, i$) is given by [19]-[21]

$$\ln p_{wn}(v; D_I, D_e, D_i) = Z(v) - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \ln[D_I G_I^2 + D_e G_e^2(v) + D_i G_i^2(v)], \quad (96)$$

with

$$Z(v) = \int \frac{F(v)}{[D_I G_I^2 + D_e G_e^2(v) + D_i G_i^2(v)]} dv, \quad (97)$$

in the Stratonovich representation. We note that our stationary distribution given by Eqs. (84)-(90) is consistent in the white-noise limit, and that the distribution for colored noise, is expressed by

$$p(v; D_I, D_e, D_i, \tau_I, \tau_e, \tau_i) = p_{wn}(v; \tilde{D}_I, \tilde{D}_e, \tilde{D}_i), \quad (98)$$

where $\tilde{D}_I$, $\tilde{D}_e$ and $\tilde{D}_i$ given by Eqs. (91)-(93) take account of effects of relaxation times. If we adopt approximate expressions for $\tilde{D}_e$ and $\tilde{D}_i$ given by Eqs. (94) and (95), we get

$$p(v; D_I, D_e, D_i, \tau_I, \tau_e, \tau_i) = p_{wn} \left(v; \frac{D_I}{(1 + \lambda\tau_I)}, \frac{D_e}{(1 + \lambda\tau_e)}, \frac{D_i}{(1 + \lambda\tau_i)} \right). \quad (99)$$

(for $\tau_e D_e \ll 1$ and $\tau_i D_i \ll 1$)

Lindner and Longtin have pointed out that the first solution of RD1 is given by [17]

$$p_{RD1}(v; D_I, D_e, D_i, \tau_I, \tau_e, \tau_i) = p_{wn} \left(v; \frac{D_I}{2}, \frac{D_e}{2}, \frac{D_i}{2} \right). \quad (100)$$

With the use of the Fourier transform of stochastic equations, Rudolph and Destexhe have obtained in RD2 [16], the stationary distribution with $D_I = 0$ given by

$$p_{RD2}(v; D_I = 0, D_e, D_i, \tau_I, \tau_e, \tau_i) = p_{wn} \left(v; D_I = 0, \frac{D_e}{(1 + \lambda\tau_e)}, \frac{D_i}{(1 + \lambda\tau_i)} \right). \quad (101)$$

It is noted that Eq. (101) coincides with Eq. (99) for $D_I = 0$. Model calculations in Sec. 3.4 have shown that the approximation given by Eq. (59) yields a good result. This is true also for the approximation given by Eqs. (94) and (95). This explains to some extent the reason why the approximation adopted in RD2 provides us with good results, as claimed in RD3 [18].

4.2 A comparison with previous approximations

We have discussed, in Sec. 2, the dynamics of the Langevin model subjected to colored model, by using the FIM. It is interesting to make a comparison among several approximate, analytical methods having been proposed so far for the Langevin model subjected to colored noise:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + G(x)\eta_1(t), \quad (102)$$

where $\eta_1(t)$ is described by the OU process of Eq. (2).

First we apply the UCNA to Eq. (102) [2, 6]. Taking the derivative of Eq.(102) with respect to t , eliminating the variable η_1 with the use of Eq. (2), and neglecting the $\ddot{x}$ term after the UCNA, we get the effective Langevin equation given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \tilde{F}(x) + \tilde{D}_1 G(x)\xi_1(t), \quad (103)$$

with

$$\tilde{F}^U = \frac{F(x)}{[1 - \tau_1(F' - FG'/G)]}, \quad (104)$$

$$\tilde{D}_1^U = \frac{D_1}{[1 - \tau_1(F' - FG'/G)]^2}. \quad (105)$$

The stationary distribution is given by

$$p(x) \propto \exp[-\ln G(x) + Y(x)], \quad (106)$$

with

$$Y(x) = \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{D}_1} \right) \int \frac{\tilde{F}(x)}{G(x)^2} dx. \quad (107)$$

In the case of $F(x) = -\lambda x$ and $G(x) = x$, we get

$$p(x) \propto x^{-[\lambda(1+\lambda\tau_1)/D_1+1]}, \quad (108)$$

which agrees with Eqs. (31) and (32) with $I = Y = 0$.

Similarly, when the system is subjected to additive colored noise only

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + \eta_0(t), \quad (109)$$

the UCNA yields the effective Langevin equation given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \tilde{F}(x) + \tilde{D}_0 \xi_0(t), \quad (110)$$

with

$$\tilde{F}^U = \frac{F(x)}{(1 - \tau_0 F')}, \quad (111)$$

$$\tilde{D}_0^U = \frac{D_0}{(1 - \tau_0 F')^2}. \quad (112)$$

The stationary distribution is given by

$$p(x) \propto \exp[Z(x)], \quad (113)$$

with

$$Z(x) = \left(\frac{1 - \tau_0 F'}{D_0} \right) \int F(x) dx. \quad (114)$$

When a system is subjected to *multiplicative* colored noise only, as given by Eq. (102), we may employ the method of a change of variable, with which it is transformed to that subjected to *additive* noise [23]:

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = \tilde{F}(y) + \eta_1(t), \quad (115)$$

where

$$y = \int \frac{dx}{G(x)} \equiv K(x), \quad (116)$$

$$\tilde{F}(y) = \frac{F(K^{-1}(y))}{G(K^{-1}(y))}. \quad (117)$$

We get the effective Langevin equation given by Eq. (103) with

$$\tilde{F}^C = F(x), \quad (118)$$

$$\tilde{D}_1^C = \frac{D_1}{[1 - \tau_1(F' - FG'/G)]}. \quad (119)$$

In the case of $F(x) = -\lambda x$ and $G_1(x) = x$, we get the distribution of $p(x)$ given by

$$p(x) \propto x^{-[\lambda(1+\lambda\tau_1)/D_1+1]}, \quad (120)$$

which agrees with Eqs. (108).

Table 1 summarizes a comparison among various approximate methods. It is noted that although the effective Langevin equation is rather different depending on the methods, the stationary distribution given by Eq. (108) or (120) agrees each other in the linear Langevin model for which the ratio of $\tilde{F}(x)/\tilde{D}_1(x)$ is the same [Eq. (107)]. Difference

among the methods may be, however, realized in dynamical properties. Figure 8(a) and 8(b) show responses of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$, respectively, to an applied pulse input given by Eq. (35), calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves) and the UCNA (chain curves) with $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_1 = 1.0$. We note that $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ at $100 < t < 200$ calculated by the FIM is in good agreement with those of DS. Those of the UCNA are, however, much larger than those of DS. This is easily understood by Eqs. (36), (37), (104) and (105), from which we get (for $D_0 \ll D_1$)

$$\mu^F(t) \simeq \frac{(A+B)}{[\lambda - D_1/(1 + \lambda\tau_1)]}, \quad (\text{for FIM}) \quad (121)$$

$$\mu^U(t) \simeq (1 + \lambda\tau_1) \mu^F(t), \quad (\text{for UCNA}) \quad (122)$$

$$\gamma^F(t) \simeq \frac{(A+B)^2 D_1 / (1 + \lambda\tau_1)}{[\lambda - 2D_1/(1 + \lambda\tau_1)][\lambda - D_1/(1 + \lambda\tau_1)]^2}, \quad (\text{for FIM}) \quad (123)$$

$$\gamma^U(t) \simeq (1 + \lambda\tau_1)^2 \gamma^F(t). \quad (\text{for UCNA}) \quad (124)$$

Similar results are obtained also for sinusoidal inputs: responses of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ to a sinusoidal input given by Eq. (38) are shown in Figs. 8(c) and 8(d), respectively. We note that their magnitudes calculated by the UCNA are again much larger than those of DS and the FIM.

It has been claimed that the UCNA is justified by the FIM [8, 9, 10]. Although the FIM starts from the formally exact expression for the probability distribution, an actual evaluation has to adopt some kinds of approximations such as $\ddot{x} = 0$ and $(\dot{x})^n = 0$ for $n \geq 2$ just as in the UCNA [2, 6]. The result of Ref. [8, 9, 10] obtained by the FIM is different from that of Ref. [7, 11, 12] derived by the alternative FIM: the final result using the FIM depends on the adopted approximations.

5 Conclusion

We have extended the FIM approach such that we may discuss dynamics of the Langevin model subjected to additive and/or multiplicative colored noises, combined with equations of motion for mean and variance of a state variable x . The stationary probability distribution and the dynamical response to time-dependent inputs have been discussed for two cases of colored noise: (a) one additive and one multiplicative colored noise, and (b) one additive and two multiplicative colored noise. Our conclusions are summarized as follows:

(i) calculated results for the both cases (a) and (b) of the FIM are in good agreement with

those of DS for not only stationary but also dynamical properties: the latter can not be well accounted for by the existing, approximate analytical methods like the UCNA [6], (ii) with increasing the relaxation time of colored noise, the width of the stationary distribution $p(x)$ becomes narrower and its non-Gaussian form approaches the Gaussian because the effective noise strength of $\tilde{D}_m$ becomes smaller than the original noise strength of D_m , and

(iii) the approximations given by Eqs. (27) and (59) for the cases (a) and (b), respectively, derived by the FIM are valid for both small and large relaxation times, which supports the result of RD2 and RD3 [16, 18].

The item (i) implies that the present FIM approach may be applicable to a wide class of realistic models for physical systems subjected to noise sources with finite correlation time. Recently we have proposed a generalized Langevin-type rate-code neuronal model including multiplicative white noise [24, 25]. It would be interesting to study effects of finite correlation time of colored noise on firing rates in neuronal ensembles based on the rate-code hypothesis, which is an alternative to the temporary-code hypothesis [26, 27].

Acknowledgements

This work is partly supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

Appendix: Derivation of the effective Fokker-Planck equation

By applying the functional-integral method to the Langevin model given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + \sum_m G_m(x) \eta_m(t), \quad (\text{A1})$$

with

$$\frac{d\eta_m(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\tau_m} \eta_m + \frac{\sqrt{2D_m}}{\tau_m} \xi_m(t), \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\langle \xi_m(t) \xi_n(t') \rangle = \delta_{mn} \delta(t - t'), \quad (\text{A3})$$

we may obtain the expression for the probability distribution: $p(x, t) = \langle \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle$ given by [7, 11]

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(x, t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} F(x) p(x, t) - \sum_m \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_m(x) \langle \eta_m(t) \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where the bracket $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the average over $p(x, t)$. Although Eq. (A4) is a formally exact expression, it is evitable to employ some approximations to perform actual calculations. In order to evaluate the average $\langle \eta_m(t) \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle$, we use the Novikov theorem [28]:

$$\langle \eta_m(t) \Phi(\eta_1, \eta_2) \rangle = \int_0^t dt' \sum_n c_{mn}(t, t') \left\langle \frac{\delta \Phi(\eta_1, \eta_2)}{\delta \eta_n} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $\Phi(\eta_1, \eta_2)$ denotes a function of η_1 and η_2 , and c_{mn} is their correlation function given by Eq. (5). From Eqs. (5) and (A5), we get

$$\langle \eta_m(t) \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle = - \int_0^t dt' c_{mm}(t, t') \left\langle \frac{\delta(\delta(x(t) - x))}{\delta x} \frac{\delta x}{\delta \eta_m(t')} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$= - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_0^t dt' c_{mm}(t, t') \left\langle \delta(x(t) - x) \frac{\delta x}{\delta \eta_m(t')} \right\rangle. \quad (\text{A7})$$

After integrating Eq. (1), we get

$$x(t) = x(0) + \int_0^t ds [F(x(s)) + \sum_m G_m(x(s)) \eta_m(s)]. \quad (\text{A8})$$

The functional derivative of $x(t)$ of Eq. (A8) with respect to $\eta_m(t')$ becomes

$$\frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta \eta_m(t')} = G_m(x(t')) + \int_{t'}^t ds [F'(x(s)) + \sum_n G'_n(x(s)) \eta_n(s)] \frac{\delta x(s)}{\delta \eta_m(t')}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

The derivative of Eq. (A9) with respect to t is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta \eta_m(t')} \right] = [F'(x(t)) + \sum_n G'_n(x(t)) \eta_n(t)] \frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta \eta_m(t')}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

The formal solution of Eq. (A10) with the initial condition:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta \eta_m(t')} \right] = G_m(x(t')), \quad (\text{A11})$$

is given by

$$\frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta \eta_m(t')} = G_m(x(t')) \exp \left[\int_{t'}^t ds [F'(x(s)) + \sum_n G'_n(x(s)) \eta_n(x(s))] \right]. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The derivative of $G_m(x(t))$ with respect to t becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt} G_m(x(t)) = G'_m(x(t)) \frac{dx(t)}{dt}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$= G'_m(x(t)) [F(x(t)) + \sum_n G_n(x(t)) \eta_n(t)]. \quad (\text{A14})$$

The integral of Eq. (A14) yields

$$G_m(x(t')) = G_m(x(t)) \exp \left[\int_t^{t'} ds \left(\frac{G'_m(x(s))}{G_m(x(s))} \right) [F(x(s)) + \sum_n G_n(x(s)) \eta_n(x(s))] \right]. \quad (\text{A15})$$

Substituting Eqs. (A12) and (A15) to Eq. (A9), we get

$$\frac{\delta x(t)}{\delta \eta_m(t')} \simeq G_m(x(t)) \exp \left(\int_{t'}^t ds \left[F'(x(s)) - \frac{G'_m(x(s))}{G_m(x(s))} F(x(s)) \right] \right), \quad (\text{A16})$$

where contributions from terms including η_n in Eq.(A12) and (A15) are neglected. Combining Eq. (A7) with Eq. (A16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \eta_m(t) \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_m(x(t)) \int_0^t dt' \\ &\times \left[c_{mm} \left\langle \delta(x(t) - x) \exp \left(\int_{t'}^t ds \left[F'(x(s)) - \frac{G'_m(x(s))}{G_m(x(s))} F(x(s)) \right] \right) \right\rangle \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

By using the decoupling approximation given by

$$\left\langle \delta(x(t) - x) \exp \left(\int_{t'}^t ds \left[F'(x(s)) - \frac{G'_m(x(s))}{G_m(x(s))} F(x(s)) \right] \right) \right\rangle \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$\simeq \langle \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle \exp \left(\left\langle \left[F'(x(t)) - \frac{G'_m(x(t))}{G_m(x(t))} F(x(t)) \right] \right\rangle (t - t') \right), \quad (\text{A19})$$

we get

$$\langle \eta_m(t) \delta(x(t) - x) \rangle \simeq \tilde{D}_m \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_m(x) p(x, t), \quad (\text{A20})$$

with

$$\tilde{D}_m = \frac{D_m}{[1 - \tau_m(\langle F' \rangle - \langle F G'_m / G_m \rangle)]}, \quad (\text{A21})$$

where $F' = dF/dx$ and $G'_m = dG_m/dx$, and the bracket $\langle \cdot \rangle$ expresses the average over $p(x, t)$. Substituting Eq. (A20) to Eq. (A4), we finally get the effective FPE given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p(x, t) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} F(x) p(x, t) + \sum_m \tilde{D}_m \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_m(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_m(x) p(x, t), \quad (\text{A22})$$

from which we get the effective Langevin equation given by

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = F(x) + \sum_m \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_m} G_m(x) \xi_m(t), \quad (\text{A23})$$

with

$$\langle \xi_m(t) \rangle = 0, \quad (\text{A24})$$

$$\langle \xi_m(t) \xi_n(t') \rangle = \delta_{mn} \delta(t - t'). \quad (\text{A25})$$

Table 1 A comparison among various methods yielding the effective equation given by $\dot{x} = \tilde{F}(x) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_0}\xi_0(t) + \sqrt{2\tilde{D}_1}G(x)\xi_1(t)$ for the Langevin model: $\dot{x} = F(x) + \eta_0(t) + G(x)\eta_1(t)$ subjected to colored noise η_m with the relaxation time τ_m ($m = 0, 1$) given by Eqs. (1) and (2); the bracket $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the average over $p(x, t)$: $F_s = F(x_s)$, $F'_s = F'(x_s)$ *etc.* for the stationary x_s (see text).

$\tilde{F}$	$\tilde{D}_0$	$\tilde{D}_1$	method
F	$D_0/(1 - \tau_0\langle F' \rangle)$	$D_1/[1 - \tau_1(\langle F' \rangle - \langle FG'/G \rangle)]$	FIM ^{a)}
F	$D_0/(1 - \tau_0 F'_s)$	$D_1/[1 - \tau_1(F'_s - F_s G'_s/G_s)]$	FIM ^{b)}
F	—	$D_1/[1 - \tau_1(F' - FG'/G)]$	CV ^{c)}
$F/[1 - \tau_1(F' - FG'/G)]$	—	$D_1/[1 - \tau_1(F' - FG'/G)]^2$	UCNA ^{d)}
$F/(1 - \tau_0 F')$	$D_0/(1 - \tau_0 F')^2$	—	UCNA ^{e)}
$F/(1 - \tau_0 F')$	$D_0/(1 - \tau_0 F')^2$	—	FIM ^{f)}
F	$D_0/(1 - \tau_0 \langle F' \rangle)$	—	MM ^{g)}

- (a) the functional-integral method (FIM; present study).
- (b) FIM (Ref. [11, 12]).
- (c) a change of variable (CV) for multiplicative colored noise only (after Ref. [23]).
- (d) UCNA calculation for multiplicative colored noise only (Ref. [6]).
- (e) UCNA calculation for additive colored noise only (Ref. [6]).
- (f) FIM for additive colored noise only (Ref. [10]).
- (g) moment method (MM) for additive colored noise only (Ref. [5]).

References

- [1] B. Lindner, J. García-Ojalvo, A. Neiman, and L. Schimansky-Gel'ér, *Physics Report* **392** (2004) 321.
- [2] P. Hänggi and P. Jung, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* **89** (1995) 239.
- [3] S. Mangioni, R. Deza, H. S. Wio, and R. Toral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 2389;
S. E. Mangioni, R. R. Deza, R. Toral, and H. S. Wio, *Phys. Rev. E* **61** (2000) 223.
- [4] Ch. R. Doering and J. C. Gadoua, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** (1992) 2318.
- [5] H. Hasegawa, *Physica A* **384** (2007) 241.
- [6] P. Jung and P. Hänggi, *Phys. Rev. A* **35** (1987) 4464.
- [7] J. M. Sancho, M. San Miguel, S. L. Katz, and J. D. Gunton, *Phys. Rev.* **26** (1982) 1589.
- [8] P. Colet, H. S. Wio, and M. San Miguel, *Phys. Rev. A* **39** (1989) 6094.
- [9] H. S. Wio, P. Colet, M. San Miguel, L. Pesquera, and M. A. Rodriguez, *Phys. Rev. A* **40** (1989) 7312.
- [10] M. A. Fuentes, R. Toral, and H. S. Wio, *Physica A* **303** (2002) 91.
- [11] G. Y. Liang, L. Cao and D. J. Wu, *Physica A* **335** (2004) 371.
- [12] D. Wu, X. Luo, and S. Zhu, *Physica A* **373** (2007) 203.
- [13] N. Brunel, F. S. Chance, N. Fourcaud, and L. F. Abbott, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 2186.
- [14] N. Fourcaud and N. Brunel, *Neural Comput.* **14** (2002) 2057.
- [15] M. Rudolph and A. Destexhe, *Neural Comput.* **15** (2003) 2577.
- [16] M. Rudolph and A. Destexhe, *Neural Comput.* **17** (2005) 2301.
- [17] B. Lindner and A. Longtin, *Neural Comput.* **18** (2006) 1896.
- [18] M. Rudolph and A. Destexhe, *Neural Comput.* **18** (2006) 2917.

- [19] H. Hasegawa, *Physica A* **374** (2006) 585.
- [20] H. Sakaguchi: *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **70** (2001) 3247.
- [21] C. Anteneodo and C. Tsallis: *J. Math. Phys.* **44** (2003) 5194.
- [22] It would be possible to analytically show that the approximation given by Eq. (59) is valid for small and large relaxation times, though we have not succeeded in it. In a simple case of $a_1 = a_2$, $e_1 = e_2$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2$, Eqs. (56) and (57) yield $\tilde{D} \equiv \tilde{D}_1 + \tilde{D}_2 = (D_1 + D_2)/[1 + \tau_1(\lambda - \tilde{D})]$, from which we get an approximate expression of $\tilde{D}_m \simeq D_m/(1 + \lambda\tau_1)$ ($m = 1, 2$) valid for $\tau_1(D_1 + D_2)/(1 + \lambda\tau_1)^2 \ll 1$, or alternatively valid for (i) $\tau_1 \ll (1/\lambda, 1/(D_1 + D_2))$ and (ii) $\tau_1 \gg (1/\lambda, (D_1 + D_2)/\lambda^2)$, just as Eq. (27) implies.
- [23] H. Risken: *The Fokker-Planck Equation: Methods of Solution and Applications*, Springer Series in Synergetics, Vol. 18 (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992).
- [24] H. Hasegawa, *Phys. Rev. E* **75** (2007) 051904.
- [25] H. Hasegawa, in *Neuronal Network Research Horizons*, edited by M. L. Weiss (Nova Science Publishers, New York, 2007), pp 61.
- [26] F. Rieke, D. Warland, R. Steveninck, and W. Bialek, *Spikes-Exploring the neural code* (MIT Press; Cambridge, 1996).
- [27] W. Gerstner and W. Kistler, *Spiking Neuron Models* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2002).
- [28] E. A. Novikov, *Soviet Phys. JETP* **20** (1965) 1290.

Figure 1: The ratio of $\tilde{D}_1/D_1$ vs. τ_1 calculated by the FIM (solid curve), the approximation (APP) given by Eq. (27) (dashed curve) and the difference of (FIM- APP) $\times 10$ (chain curve) with $I = 0.5$, $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$.

Figure 2: (Color online) The stationary distributions $p(x)$ for $\tau_1 = 0.1$ [(a), (b)], $\tau_1 = 1.0$ [(c), (d)] and $\tau_1 = 5.0$ [(e), (f)] calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the approximation given by Eq. (27) (APP; chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (WN; double chain curves) with $I = 0.5$, $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$: (a), (c) and (e) are in normal scale, and (b), (d) and (f) are in log scale.

Figure 3: (Color online) The response of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ to pulse input for $\tau_1 = 0.1$ [(a), (b)], $\tau_1 = 1.0$ [(c), (d)] and $\tau_1 = 5.0$ [(e), (f)] calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the approximation (APP) given by Eq. (27) (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (double chain curves) with $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$: $\mu(t)$ is plotted in (a), (c) and (f), $\gamma(t)$ in (b), (d) and (f), and a pulse input $I(t)$ given by Eq. (35) is shown at bottoms of (a), (c) and (e). The ordinate of (f) is different from those of (b) and (d): $\gamma(t)$ in the white-noise limit (double-chain curve) is multiplied by a factor of $1/5$.

Figure 4: (Color online) The response of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ to sinusoidal input for $\tau_1 = 0.1$ [(a), (b)], $\tau_1 = 1.0$ [(c), (d)] and $\tau_1 = 5.0$ [(e), (f)] calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the approximation given by Eq. (27) (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (double chain curves) with $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$: $\mu(t)$ is plotted in (a), (c) and (f), $\gamma(t)$ in (b), (d) and (f), and a sinusoidal input $I(t)$ given by Eq. (38) is shown at bottoms of (a), (c) and (e). The ordinate of (f) is different from those of (b) and (d): $\gamma(t)$ in the white-noise limit (double-chain curve) is multiplied by a factor of $1/5$.

Figure 5: (Color online) The ratio of $\tilde{D}_m/D_m$ vs. $\tau_1 (= \tau_2/10)$ ($m = 1, 2$) calculated by the FIM ($m = 1$, solid curve; $m = 2$, dashed curve) and the difference of (FIM- APP) $\times 50$ ($m = 1$, chain curve; $m = 2$, double-chain curve) with $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.1$, $D_2 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$, results of the APP being given by $\tilde{D}_m^{APP}$ in Eq. (59).

Figure 6: (Color online) The stationary distributions $p(x)$ for $\tau_1 = 0.05$, $\tau_2 = 0.5$ [(a), (b)], $\tau_1 = 0.5$, $\tau_2 = 5.0$ [(c), (d)] and $\tau_1 = 5.0$, $\tau_2 = 50.0$ [(e), (f)] calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the approximation given by Eq. (59) (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (double chain curves) with $I = 0.5$, $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.1$, $D_2 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$: (a), (c) and (e) are in normal scale, and (b), (d) and (f) are in log scale.

Figure 7: (Color online) The response of $\mu(t)$ and $\gamma(t)$ to pulse input for $\tau_1 = 0.05$, $\tau_2 = 0.5$ [(a), (b)], $\tau_1 = 0.1$, $\tau_2 = 1.0$ [(c), (d)] and $\tau_1 = 0.5$, $\tau_2 = 5.0$ [(e), (f)] calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves), the approximation given by Eq. (59) (chain curves) and in the white-noise limit (double chain curves) with $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_0 = 0.01$, $D_1 = 0.1$, $D_2 = 0.2$ and $\tau_0 = 0.01$: $\mu(t)$ is plotted in (a), (c) and (f), $\gamma(t)$ in (b), (d) and (f), and an input pulse $I(t)$ given by Eq. (35) is shown at bottoms of (a), (c) and (e). The ordinate of (f) is different from those of (b and (d): $\gamma(t)$ in the white-noise limit (double-chain curve) is multiplied by a factor of $1/5$.

Figure 8: (Color online) Time courses of $\mu(t)$ (a) and γ (b) for a pulse input and those of $\mu(t)$ (c) and γ (d) for a sinusoidal input, calculated by the FIM (solid curves), DS (dashed curves) and the UCNA (chain curves) for $\lambda = 1.0$, $D_1 = 0.2$ and $\tau_1 = 1.0$: pulse and sinusoidal inputs $I(t)$ given by Eqs. (35) and (38), respectively, are shown at the bottoms of (a) and (c).

This figure "fig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig4.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig5.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig6.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig7.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>

This figure "fig8.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/0708.2563v3>